

GFEP RFAs

Request For Action		RFA Number: 1
RFA Date:	02/12/04	
Project:	GLAST	
System:	GLAST Front End Processor	
Review:	GFEP Peer Review	
Review Date:	February 12, 2004	
Originator:	Chris Spinolo and Matt Kirichok	
Discrepancy/ Problem:	Sustaining engineering is not addressed in this review. This impacts how OS updates, security patches, GFEP SW updates and the capability of the MOC to configure and verify configuration of the GFEP.	
Recommended Action:	Generate a sustaining engineering plan for the GFEP that includes the spare systems. Require a system administration “terminal” on the closed IONET in the MOC.	
Assignee:		
RFA Response:		

Request For Action		RFA Number: 2
RFA Date:	02/12/04	
Project:	GLAST	
System:	GLAST Front End Processor	
Review:	GFEP Peer Review	
Review Date:	February 12, 2004	
Originator:	Chris Spinolo	
Discrepancy/ Problem:	WAN data rate estimates for WSC, LEO and I&T may not be adequate. Data rates should not make any assumptions on excess capacity in the network. Data rates should assume the project is rate limited to the requested rates.	
Recommended Action:	Perform a network bandwidth analysis and establish strict requirements for mission success and for desired response. Then pick a rate within that range which satisfies the cost drivers.	
Assignee:		
RFA Response:		

Request For Action		RFA Number: 3
RFA Date:	02/12/04	
Project:	GLAST	
System:	GLAST Front End Processor	
Review:	GFEP Peer Review	
Review Date:	February 12, 2004	
Originator:	Mike Rackley	
Discrepancy/ Problem:	No explicit requirement exists for a ground receipt time.	
Recommended Action:	Add requirement and factor capability into the design. The accuracy and resolution of the time stamp also needs to be defined.	
Assignee:		
RFA Response:		

Request For Action		RFA Number: 4
RFA Date:	02/12/04	
Project:	GLAST	
System:	GLAST Front End Processor	
Review:	GFEP Peer Review	
Review Date:	February 12, 2004	
Originator:	Matt Kirichok	
Discrepancy/ Problem:	Contingency requirements and return to service requirements were not presented or addressed.	
Recommended Action:	Describe how the ground system pages FOT. Explain operational concept of what GFEP and the MOC/MCE does during different failure scenarios.	
Assignee:		
RFA Response:		

Request For Action		RFA Number: 5
RFA Date:	02/12/04	
Project:	GLAST	
System:	GLAST Front End Processor	
Review:	GFEP Peer Review	
Review Date:	February 12, 2004	
Originator:	Mike Rackley	
Discrepancy/ Problem:	The interface between the MOC system and the GFEP MCE is not well defined in terms of the TDRSS support schedule and the GFEP-generated status data.	
Recommended Action:	Mature the interface definition and the plan for operational socket management (control/status and data).	
Assignee:		
RFA Response:		

Request For Action		RFA Number: 6
RFA Date:	02/12/04	
Project:	GLAST	
System:	GLAST Front End Processor	
Review:	GFEP Peer Review	
Review Date:	February 12, 2004	
Originator:	Mike Rackley	
Discrepancy/ Problem:	The current design of the playback GFEP does not allow for automatically initiate transmission of VC files after the contact (an automated file push). As presented, the transmission is initiated by a message from the MOC	
Recommended Action:	Investigate an approach where the PB GFEP operates more autonomously in terms of initiating the transfer of VC files.	
Assignee:		
RFA Response:		

Request For Action		RFA Number: 7
RFA Date:	02/12/04	
Project:	GLAST	
System:	GLAST Front End Processor	
Review:	GFEP Peer Review	
Review Date:	February 12, 2004	
Originator:	Mike Rackley	
Discrepancy/ Problem:	The NENS contractor is currently not tasked to support the GFEP implementation effort.	
Recommended Action:	Work with the Mission Commitment Mgr. (Leslie Ambrose) to get a NENS/GFEP support task in place.	
Assignee:		
RFA Response:		